

The Republican.

No. 25, VOL. 10.] LONDON, Friday, Dec. 24, 1824. [PRICE 6d.

COPY OF A MEMORIAL SENT TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE ROBERT PEEL, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, December 18, 1824.

THOUGH I have addressed many a letter to you, I have just recollected, that I have never sent you a memorial of my services to the state, of my sufferings for the state's good. And, as you, gentlemen in office, must do and receive every thing in a formal and official manner, we, poor sufferers, out of office, must, with all humility, observe a corresponding formality, or be neglected, or kicked *ex officio*.

This, then, comes with all humility, formality, ceremony, and compliment, to memorialize you, that, I am in the sixth year of an imprisonment, for having been guilty of publishing two books, that quarrelled with an old family book, as to its goodness and utility.

It is very hard, that men should be made to suffer for the disagreement of books, upon matters, which, they, as men, know nothing about; and cruel that a man should be kept in prison five years, because, books cannot be made to agree. You may as well punish a watch-maker, for not making his watches to keep time with the watches of another maker; or a man, because, his wife will chatter with and slander her neighbours; or children, because, they do not always keep of one and the same humour at all times; or Catholics, because, they are not Protestants; or Jews, because, they were circumcised in their infancy, and not allowed to neglect that sacred rite with the Christians. - All these things may be as justly done, as to make a man suffer pains and penalties for the disagreement of books about metaphysical matters, and, begging your pardon for such a *lapsus lingue*, no! *lapsus calami*, to punish him the most whose books gets nearest to

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 84, Fleet Street.

the truth. This is like punishing the watchmaker, that should make the best watch!

I am quite sure, that the heads of the state have been turned upside down, as to matters of right and wrong, ever since I have been a prisoner; but, I hope, to succeed in setting them upright. And, this, you will be pleased to receive, as an illustrative preface to my memorial?

About six years ago, in some day of this week, I published a book, with a very useful, or pretty title, nothing less than the "AGE OF REASON, being an *investigation of true and fabulous* THEOLOGY."

One would have thought, that such a book, with such a title, would have led its author, or publisher, at once, to the primacy of the Church; for what can a Church desire so much, as the investigation and distinction of the true from a fabulous theology? But, no! it seems, that, every Church has its own peculiar theology, and that each is the true one to its peculiar church. The church, in truth, is the theology, and has no external connection, save an embrace now and then with the state.

Whether, or not, my author knew this, I cannot say; but, I know, that his poor publisher, instead of getting into Lambeth Palace with his "AGE OF REASON" and his "TRUE THEOLOGY," has gotten into Dorchester Gaol, and cannot find the way out again! This comes of a man's meddling with divine matters, which are above the understanding of all but divinely-inspired men.

I am very sorry, Mr. Peel, for what I have done, and hope you will let me out: I promise you most earnestly and most faithfully, that I will not meddle with any more *true* theologies; but try to get into Lambeth Palace by another route. I promise you most faithfully, that I will war with and beat down all the *false* theologies that disturb the inmates of Lambeth Palace. Never more, never more, will I meddle with a true theology, whether investigated and brought forth by Thomas Paine or any other theologian. Pray let me out.

Soon after I published that pretty titled book, the "Age of Reason," I published another, with as pretty a title: "Principles of Nature," by Elihu Palmer. For publishing this book, I thought to have had F. R. S., F. A. S., and all sorts of A. S. S. attached to the name of RICHARD CARLILE, ESQUIRE; but, alas! here again, I was woefully mistaken; for the true theology of Lambeth Palace seemed opposed to every one of my "Principles of Nature:" and, I found

myself, very *unnaturally*, as I thought, locked up in a close room of Dorchester Gaol, to see nothing but bricks and iron bars, to hear nothing but the clanking of chains and heavy keys, the cries of mangled nerves under the lash, preparations for hanging, and so forth.

Well, to get out again, I will give up *nature* and *true theology* too, and stick, in future, to the right sort of *matter*. Pray ask the Archbishop of Canterbury, or his and your master, the head of the church, if he will not consent to my terms. Tell them, that I have grown a deal wiser than I was, and shall know better how to take care of myself in future.

Well, Sir, for publishing these two pretty titled books, I was both *informed* against and *indicted*! I was told, that an "AGE OF REASON," a "TRUE THEOLOGY," and the "PRINCIPLES OF NATURE," had highly displeased Almighty God! though, I could not tell how, nor would they tell me, who so said and so wrote.

I subpœnaed the Almighty God of Lambeth Palace, to appear in Court at my trial; but the Judge very unjustly refused to allow me to ask if he was the Almighty personage displeased. I could not think of a higher personage at the moment, that could be displeased with my pretty titled books; but I have since been sorry, that I did not subpœna the then Prince Regent and now King, as the highest known personage on this part of the earth.

I had also the High Priest of the Jews in Court; but I was not allowed to ask him, if he was the high personage displeased.

I had the Royal Astronomer, as the Ambassador to our Court, from all the high personages that dwell on the planets around us, to ask him, if he knew, who or where that personage was, whom I had displeased; but the unjust judge would not allow me to ask him such a question.

I had also as many heads of the different true theologies, as I could collect, such as the Unitarian, the Freethinking Christian, the Swedenborgian, and others, too numerous to mention, so numerous, that, I may say with Saint John, that if their names were all written in books, the world could not contain them for number*.

I had also, in court, Mr. George Somers Clarke, the Vicar of Waltham, in Essex, a very learned man, with his Hebrew and Arabic Manuscripts of the Bible, to shew, that

* See Saint John's Gospel at the end.

Thomas Paine had really separated the true from the fabulous theology : and, moreover, this learned Doctor happened to be at college with the then and present Chief Justice, and happened to be a preceptor to the then Mr. Abbott; and the Doctor assured me, by letter, that, when at college, the Chief Justice, or Mr. Abbott, was singularly attached to the *true* theology of Lucretius. Had Chief Justice Abbott done me justice in Court, the Doctor would have reminded him of it.

No one was allowed to come forward to say that they were displeased with my conduct. There was no person to say a word against me, but the lawyers, who were paid for it, and who, consequently, could not be disinterested evidences. And, all they could say, was, that, my two pretty titled books had offended another book, that has no title, nor any contents that can entitle it to a title, like the "AGE OF REASON," and "PRINCIPLES OF NATURE."

The Jury, or Juries, without a shadow of evidence, said, that I was *guilty* of highly displeasing almighty God! There was not a shadow of evidence, to support any one allegation of the information or indictment. It was charged against me, that my books had offended the Christian Religion, and the Judge refused to receive evidence, as to what constituted the Christian Religion; asserting, that, *that* was identified and established, about which, all, who call themselves Christians, disagree! He said, that, Christianity was part and parcel of the Common Law, when that law knew nothing of Protestant Christianity, knew nothing of any Christianity, but that which is called Roman Catholic, the very adherence to which, is now, so far illegal, in this country, as to disable a man from filling a high office of state, and, against which, almost every public officer is obliged to swear, that it is damnable and idolatrous!

I was not indicted upon any statute, and though I adduced a statute in my behalf, the Unitarian act of the 53rd of George the Third, which expressly made lawful the whole contents of my books, it was rejected and I was condemned!

So, you will see, Mr. Peel, if you will condescend to look calmly and fairly at my case, that, I have offended no law; that, I was indicted upon no law; that, I was tried and condemned without law, or rather, condemned without trial; and that, the existing law, which was clearly in my favour, was spurned and rejected by the Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench.

I deny the possibility altogether of making Christianity

a part and parcel of the law. I deny the possibility of doing it by any express enactment of the legislature; because, it is not a matter to be defined as to its properties and pretensions, so as to be brought within the meaning and decision of a law.

As an addition to this insurmountable difficulty, with respect to Christianity, I can prove, that, there is no evidence of the existence of such a person, as its alleged founder; and all the negative evidence to the contrary, that can be desired. I can prove, that no such a people as the Jews or Israelites inhabited the land of Judea, as lately called, prior to the Babylonian Colonization under the Persian Princes, to receive such promises as a nation, as are alleged in the books of the Old Testament. And, finally, I can prove, that there is no such a God in existence, as any man has preached, or written of: and, that, there is no superhuman intelligent power in existence, equal to the regulation of the most trivial matter that passes upon this planet, on which we live to persecute and give pain to each other.

These are all so many valid objections to Christianity being any part or parcel of the law of this country. But even if we waive all these valid objections, even if we admit for the sake of argument, that Christianity can be, or is, a part and parcel of the law, I still assert, that, I have offended no law; for, it is no offence against the annually varying law of this country, to blaspheme any part, or even the whole of it. You, as a member of the legislature, cannot call upon the House of Commons, for the repeal of any law, without giving such reasons, as to its badness or inutility, as shall amount to a blasphemy towards the law. Every petition against negro-slavery, every petition for the rendering milder the criminal code, is a blasphemy against the law of the land. If Christianity be a part and parcel of the law of the land, I claim the right, as a native of this land, to call for its change, or repeal, or to say, or to write, any thing about it, that I may think proper. It is not a property of which a man can be deprived: it is not a virtue, in which he may be corrupted: but it is a vice, of which he may be morally cured; it is an ignorance, of which he may be enlightened; it is an error, of which he may be convinced.

The church, with absolute power, is the only legislature, that can establish and administer a law about Christianity: and Lord Coke has expressly laid it down as the law and custom of this country that offences against religion are not within the connusance of the Common Law Courts. The

bringing of such matters under the Common Law Courts was an illegal step, a step without any sanction of the legislature, first taken, by the Lawyers, in the reign of Charles the Second, and continued to this day, upon no other authority, than that of Sir Matthew Hale, in opposition to Lord Coke and all former precedents and authorities.

The Reformation from Roman Catholicism was an entire abolition of all previously existing ecclesiastical authority to take cognisance of offences against religion, and the Legislature has never given the New Church any new powers upon that head; so, that, in fact, Christianity is utterly unconnected with, and unsupported by, the law of England, if we except the unrepealed part of the Blasphemy Act of the 9th and 10th of William and Mary; whilst the passing and purport of that act corroborates my conclusion. Upon that Statute, I was not indicted; because, it defines an amount of punishment quite moderate in comparison with that which I have received.

My memorial now cometh to the more serious part of this theological drama: a really serious part, to any man who has fellow feeling and loves honesty.

The other three Judges of the Court of King's Bench, so far put their sanction upon what the Chief Justice had done, as, on the 16th day of November, 1819, to sentence me to three years of imprisonment in this Gaol, and to the payment of fines to the amount of fifteen hundred pounds. And this only for the publication of the two books mentioned.

To aggravate this sentence a writ of the *levari-facias* was immediately issued by the Court of Kings' Bench against my property, which was seized within a few hours of my sentence being passed.

That property consisted of my stock in trade, furniture, and fixtures of the house and shop.

A Bailiff was placed in the house, and, very foolishly on my part, maintained by my family for six weeks.

In that time, my wife had been delivered of a child in a fortnight after the seizure, and as soon as she could rise from her bed, it was sold to a broker by the Sheriff.

After shutting up the shop, and stopping a business, the average profits of which, for three months, had been fifty pounds a week, the Sheriff, to avoid the rent due at Christmas, removed the stock in trade, on the 24 of December, and took £54. in money, from a broker, for a part of the furniture and fixtures.

The number of books acknowledged in the return of the

Sheriff exceeded sixty seven thousand ; but, I have reasons to believe, that a vast quantity were purloined, and that, every individual brought to the house by the Sheriff, was a thief encouraged to take what he pleased of my property. This stock in trade was removed to an Auction Mart in Chancery Lane, under a pretence of sale, but never has been sold to this day. After three years had elapsed, about five hundred pounds worth of it to me, were sold in the Mart, for about thirty-five pounds; and, as far as I know, the remainder remains unsold to this day.

I have made various unsuccessful applications to the Court of King's Bench to have it disposed of; I have been denied a personal appearance in Court by Habeas Corpus for that purpose: and, if I employ a Barrister, it seems to me, that a sop is instantly put into his mouth; for, I have never been able to get any answer or successful motion made as to the disposal of the property.

Even when I brought an action and obtained a verdict against the surviving Sheriff Perkins, Chief Justice Abbott, did all he could do to deprive me of just damages, by most illegally and outrageously cautioning the jury, to consider my general pretensions, as an individual, unconnected with that action!

In short, the whole of my treatment has been a uniform violation of the existing law. Those who administer the law, and even impartially in other cases, have conspired against me to violate it, to deny me all redress and all means of procedure to final justice.

I lay it down as an axiom, both in the law of this country and in justice, that, if my property was not fit to be sold by the Sheriff, it was not fit to be seized and detained by him, under that pretence; that the Sheriff should have examined the nature of the property, in the course of the six weeks that he closed the house and stopped the business, and before he removed it to an Auction Mart, that, being by law bound to pursue the best and most ready means of sale, he was not justified in removing a stock in trade to an Auction Mart, which would have sold much better on the premises where it was seized. I may be answered, that, on this head, I must seek damages from the Sheriff. I reply, that, in this case, the Sheriff, Rothwell, since dead, and also, his Under Sheriff, Turner, acted wholly under the instructions of the Law Officers of the Crown. I have evidence, that, when the Sheriff's principal officer in the seizure was asked, in February, 1820, when the sale would take place, he answered:

" we have written to the Lord Chief Justice about it, and he has answered, that we must wait until he has instructions from the Cabinet." The question now seems to have been moved from the Cabinet into Chancery.

In addition to this first seizure and removal of property from my premises in Fleet Street, another seizure was made in February, 1822, of all that I had again accumulated at that time, and many articles for which money had been taken from the Broker by the Sheriff on the former seizure. This was done, just at the time, that you entered office, Mr. Peel, and, I dare say, that you know something about it.

This second seizure dispossessed me of the house and fixtures, and of a new stock in trade, just as I had surmounted the difficulties brought upon me by the first seizure, and had begun to obtain a second profitable business. This was done by the authority of some process, about the fines, from the Court of Exchequer, the particulars of which, it being but the minor evil, I never enquired. I know, that I lost the house and the stock, and that, by virtue of the lease by which I held it, the lessor can sue me for four hundred pounds when he pleases.

In addition to all this pain, and seizing of property ; in addition to this, to me more than threefold payment of the fines of £1500, I have been kept two years in this Gaol beyond the three years to which I was sentenced ; under the very modest pretence, on your part, that I do not apply those means, of which, I may now even legally say, that, I have been robbed, and, in the withholding of which, you must necessarily have been a participator.

I never had the means of paying my fines otherwise than they have been paid, having uniformly anticipated all returns of money in trade by the creation of stock. And if I could have paid them, or gotten them paid, in cash, at the first seizure, in 1819, I should, certainly, by this time, have been a very rich man, I should have gone on making a fortune, as rapid as ever did your father.

I am, Sir, your prisoner.

RICHARD CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Concluded from page 764.

O, ye credulous believers in soothsaying, and priestcraft, how easily are ye deceived, and misled by visionaries, impostors, and fanatics; analyze but the accounts they give of themselves, and of their doings, and the film which renders you so purblind would presently drop from your eyes. What, in the nineteenth century, among *a most thinking people*, will the histories of astrologers go current? If so, when will mankind reject the conceits of visionaries, the tricks of jugglers, and cease to look upon the simple operations of nature, as marvellous and the effects of *supernatural* causes, or to suppose, effects produced, which exist only in imagination? It was time for the poor slaves of the last, the anvil, and the loom, to step forward and shame their brethren out of their conceit of university learning, God's annointed, oracle-mongers, casters of nativities, and juggling deceivers.

My answerer proceeds to say: "Mr. Watson may ask,

1 "Why the moon attracts the waters?

2 "Why the planets revolve round their common centre?

3 "Why light is produced by the action of the sun?

4 "Why the universe itself was created? And should the philosophers fail in giving a satisfactory answer to these *unreasonable* questions, he may consider,

5 "As he says, EVERY science which he is unable to comprehend to be founded in error and knavery."

I have numbered the several parts of the foregoing paragraph for the sake of brevity in answering it.

1 I should not ask the first question, because water being a fluid element, being in the moon, as is reasonably imagined superabundant, and as one element has a chemical affinity towards particles of the same element, there is a natural disposition during the rotatory motion of the earth, in the waters of the sea nearest the moon to be attracted towards that satellite*.

* The attraction of the waters of the earth by the moon, and the existence of any water on the moon, are two points disputed by Sir Richard Phillips. For the particulars of which, I refer to

2 I should not ask the second question, because Newton has proved that it is a property of matter to gravitate to the centre, and this gives it, in spherical bodies, a revolving motion.

3 I should not ask the third question because it is known by observation, that it is the quality of fire to give light and to be most luminous, when its blaze or rays are reflected by translucent bodies, like the atmosphere of the globe.

4 I should not ask the fourth question, because the universe could not have been *created*; matter must always have existed in some way or other; the universe is matter *ergo*, the universe must always have existed. Matter is constantly in motion, it is constantly changing its position, the universe is matter *ergo*—the universe is constantly interchanging the positions of its identities. Nothing is stationary, all nature is in activity; the motion of matter, is the life of the universe and all minor things. So have I endeavoured with as little technicality as possible to answer my answerer, and to make myself understood, without money and without price, without interest, or a desire of reward by persons of common sense, which is what I wish the astrologer to do, if their art really possesses the powers they declare, or if it really can be simplified.

5 I no where say, that *every* SCIENCE which I am unable to comprehend is founded in error and knavery, I am seldom so unqualified in my decisions—although I am perhaps as decisive in opinions as most persons.

But I think it very knavish in men to be taking money for soothsaying, and casting nativities, from their ignorant and deluded votaries, when there can be no utility in the knowledge imparted, or pretended to be imparted.

his Theory of the Universe: being modest enough to be very contentedly ignorant upon such subjects, as well as upon astrology.

I may also add, in reference to Mr. W.'s second paragraph, that Sir Richard disputes the whole of Newton's theory about gravitation, attraction and projectile forces: and Mr. Watson will find by due examination, that Newton has proved nothing decisive upon these heads.

I was not aware of the existence of a periodical work that advocated astrology, until I received this communication. I promise the astrologers, that I will brush up my ignorance, remove my modesty, and try if I cannot ask them some questions to the purpose in the course of a few weeks, since they are willing to answer all questions upon the subject of their science.

R. C.

In this respect, I class them with priests, who advance dogmas which have no foundation in truth and nature, who raise up ideal phantoms to work upon the feelings and fears, the better to fleece their superstitious, and credulous disciples.

In elucidation of his art, my answerer says, he "will take the nativity of his late majesty George the Third, the judgment of which will be given in the next," and what utility will there be in doing this? had the astrologers been truly loyal and patriotic and *could* have foretold by casting George's nativity, the events of his reign; they might probably have saved that perverse man from much disgrace, and the country from the separation of the States of America, much loss of wealth, a host of useful lives, and from the odium of fighting the battles of the Bourbons. Yet upon second thoughts, if men are under the controul of the planetary system, the old gentleman and his wicked advisers, ought to be pitied not blamed, for not only the events of the life of men, are said to be decided by the conjunction of planets, but it is pretended, that the most trivial circumstances of human life are dependant on their positions.

It is pretended for instance, that "mercury in cancer, signifies a person of low stature, of an indifferent, generally a pale, complexion," (are no blacks ever born under this aspect?) "black hair, thin face, sharp nose; in disposition, hasty, choleric, proud, conceited, ambitious of honor, inflexible, a braggart, and often addicted to contention."

Alas poor mortals, how insignificant are you rendered, between the astrologers and priests, between the operations of matter and spirit, Gods and planets.

Where is thy vaunted pre-eminence, O man! over the beasts of the field; the generous steed, the sagacious hound, or the lordly lion? Is not their instinct better than thy reason? If thy very disposition, acts, and will, are "bound fast in fate;" ignorance under such circumstances would be bliss, and, agreeable to the aforesaid Cornelius Agrippa, the "sciences" all "vanity."

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

JAMES WATSON.

MR. ROBERT GOURLAY.

I HAVE been for some time wishing for a subject in which I could introduce this gentleman's name and case ; and now he has furnished me with the opportunity. It will be recollected, that, in the last Session of Parliament, Mr. Gourlay assaulted or interrupted Mr. Brougham, in the lobby of the House of Commons : that, for so doing, he was ordered into the custody of the Serjeant at Arms : that, he remained in that custody until the prorogation of the Parliament : that, he was, on being liberated from that custody, sane and without bond or accusation, immediately found to be *insane* by some Bow Street Police men ; because, he was walking through the streets towards his lodgings with a friend quietly and orderly ; that some medical men, who seem to make a traffic of this sort of villainy, swore to his insanity, which was an all sufficient proof of theirs, or some worse disease, moral and physical : that, under this swearing, the Bow Street Magistrate conspired with these villains, to commit him to the House of Correction : and that, he still remains a prisoner in the Cold Bath Fields Prison, most manfully refusing all compromise of the matter ; in every sense of the word a prisoner of choice, with the exception, that, to be at liberty, he must compromise the matter by giving bail for good behaviour, which he can, but most worthily refuses to give. Such a man as this is a pearl of great value in a war with any kind of tyranny, and I say this with the more satisfaction ; because, Mr. G. differs from myself as to the minutiae of all great political questions.

This question, or Mr. Gourlay's case, concerns every honest man and woman in the country : me it concerns more particularly. Last year, there were all sorts of schemes going on to find me insane ; but I baffled the Christian wretches, who were scheming the measure. When that son of a whore, Sturt, was sent by Eldon, Peel, and the Earl of Shaftesbury, to put the handcuffs upon me ; before coming into my room, an alarm was sent through the Gaol among the prisoners, that *Mr. Carlile was raving mad, and that the Sheriff, Magistrates, Gaoler, and Turnkeys were gone into his room with ropes to tie him down !* The same evening, a man was ready to be sent off to London, a smuggler, of the name of William Waters, and this man was furnished

with this tale of my madness, and all the particulars, how the ropes were placed to fasten me down! In getting to London, he was lodged in the Giltspur Street Compter, where I had then three, or two, shopmen; for Humphrey Boyle had left, or was about leaving; and this tale was communicated to them immediately on the arrival of the smuggler. They, of course, made the quickest possible communication to Mrs. Carlile: and thus, in about twenty-four hours after the hand-cuffing, the report of my madness was current throughout London! I anticipated this rumour about insanity, by a sort of instinct, before I could hear from London, and the next morning, at nine o'clock, I walked down round the Gaol Yards, to shew myself to the prisoners, not having been out of my room before for nine months. I have not a doubt now, after thirteen months consideration of the matter, that if I had made the least resistance to the handcuffing, which was as cold-blooded a stratagem as ever tyrant or villain practised upon a man in a prison, that Sturt, or the Gaoler, or both, were prepared to shoot me, under the plea of outrageous madness, or violence on my part. However, instead of being mad, I was so cool, and collected, and dignified, that you could see both Sturt and the Gaoler gnash their teeth with malicious vexation: and the Gaoler is a very picture of what the New Testament says about Devils and sinners gnashing their teeth. We read in the Bible about flames of fire, or gass, in a state of combustion, issuing forth snortingly from the nostrils of Jehovah! and I swear, that the hydrogen which issued forth sneezingly, or snortingly, from the nostrils of my Gaoler, was all but in a state of combustion, on his first visit to me, after my publishing of that little interesting phrenological account of him and his brother saints in No. 7, Vol. X. of this work, or the first letter to Henry Charles Sturt, as his mother called him.

However, to come back to Mr. Gourlay's case, I heartily commend him, for what he is doing, as to the refusal to give bail, and think, that, he merits the country's gratitude, for such firmness, in such a peculiar and interesting situation. Our Parliament, such as it is, must meet his case in its next session. And, if Mr. Brougham has a sense of duty in the matter, he is the person most interested in moving it. It is far from me to approve the assault, or interruption, or whatever it was; I think the step was *little* on the part of Mr. Gourlay—a playing of the fine gentleman, who has no courage but what the ridiculous law of honour imposes upon him;

and who, if he can but fire without bullets, feels, that his courage has saved his honour! If Mr. Brougham had neglected or insulted Mr. Gourlay, the latter should have thrashed him manfully with the goose quill; at all times, the best sort of fighting: and the best test of honour, honesty, and courage.

As Mr. Gourlay's case is wholly a question as to state of mind, I have to apologize to the readers of the Republican, in saying, that nothing but his peculiar situation could have induced me to consent to print, in this publication, such an uninteresting and uninteresting series of letters as are about to follow this heading. But I feel it to be a duty, in every man in the country, who has a press in his power, to do something towards the exposure of the villainy of charging insanity upon a man, so peculiarly methodical and cool as is Mr. Gourlay. And knowing, that Mr. G. is an industrious man, and a voluminous writer, I have to caution him, that no such another batch of letters will be admissible to the pages of this work. The greatest bore to an editor, and to his readers, is a voluminous correspondent, who writes about nothing and is still incessantly writing. - I have had a few of this kind; but have resolved to exclude them, and all of the sort, for the future. Mr. Gourlay must make a smart advance in his political and theological knowledge, before I shall deem him *sane enough* to be my regular correspondent. I see, that he is just but in his infancy, as to the question, which I, so much younger in years, am discussing. He has been wading through, or sticking fast in quagmires, whilst I have either jumped over or walked round them, evading a mass of filth, of which, when gathered, it is difficult to clean oneself. He talks about the coarseness, and abuse, and vulgarity, and dirt of my writing; but there is no such objectionable matter about me; the fact is, that his vision is foul and polluted, he has not yet cleaned himself of the dirt which he gathered in the slough of superstition. I was very angry with Mr. Hume, and think, that I should have been a fine gentleman, with honour enough to challenge or cane him, if I had been at large, for his yielding so much to the saints, in and out of the House of Commons, as to say, that the Republican was partly filled with "*ribaldry*." I deny the existence of either ribaldry, coarseness, abuse, vulgarity, or dirt, in the Republican; and I appeal from the polluted vision of the present day to the more clear and clean of the future, when men shall be able to judge without the aid of the foul eyes of Christianity. The only free course

that will suit your Gospel, Mr. Gourlay, is the course, that Mr. Cobbett is advocating, the Roman Catholic course, that allows *no readers*, but has all preachers and hearers: the preachers being those who feed on Gospel-crumbs, and of course, expound with plaudits, the Gospel, that returns them an easily-earned thousand a year.

As to his descending from Gods to pigs, and putting the question of the existence of a God upon the existence of two kinds of pigs, one with, one without, a tail, I have to observe, that, I do not consider it a *descent*, but an *ascent*, when we leave Gods, which are phantoms, to talk about pigs which are substances, *material*. Mr. Gourlay may startle, and so did I, when I heard Thomas Paine first called a very superstitious man, and when, I first read John Stewart's book, which speaks with equal contempt of deism and dogism. I have to inform Mr. G., that I know nothing more about God now, than I did, when I was a year old; if I except my knowledge of the folly, the insanity of mankind, about this shadowless personification. And I would ask him, after all his deep reflections about one pig with, and another pig without, a tail, what he is the nearer knowing any thing about a God? Can he find a God with or without a tail? For though Moses tells us, that he saw the breech, he made no observation, as to whether Jehovah had or had not a tail! If he knows nothing about a God, he must know, that religion to him is false, and without good foundation, and that it is, consequently, an injurious vice.

But this pig-tail story, which, in the way of imitation, will be but short, reader, calls for a few more words. When Mr. Gourlay reflected upon God making one pig without, and another pig with, a tail, did he not ask himself, why his God did not, or could not, make all his pigs alike? why he made one pig to live by eating another pig? And after all, whether his God keeps a piggery where he lives, and where? Does Mr. Gourlay know, that there have been men and even Christians with tails? Does he know, that Lord Monboddo, though I do not concur with him, supposed all mankind to have originally had tails? Does he know the story about the Kentish people and their tails, and how it is said, that they grew out as a punishment, because some of them would not become Christians, or did not receive well, the first Christian Monks that disgraced this country? Gad, he does not seem to know any thing about the theology of tails and the tailless theology! I would have the Christian women to beware that they do not marry Christian husbands

with tails. They had better see or feel before they tie the final knot. It was but lately, that I read a very pretty story in Telliamed, about a Christian man with a tail.

Mr. Gourlay may possibly learn, if he be kept quiet another year, that all the processes of animal and vegetable growth, that all the barks, and branches, and leaves, and fruit, and tails, and hair, and wool, and feathers, is a species of fibrous or nervous growth, that needs not the aid of a God to regulate it. And when he has dived into this matter, he, too, will become a Materialist; he, too, will see, that there is not such a God in existence as any man has preached; he, too, will see, that all religion is vice: and when he sees this, we shall have a greater degree of proof of his *sanity* than we now have; though now he is tolerable.

I have heard, that this Chaplain of the Cold Bath Fields Prison is a great hypocrite: and Mr. Gourlay's letters to him will convince any one who reads them of the truth of what I have heard. He had the impudence to come to my shop in Fleet Street the other day, and to boast that he had made a convert of William Tunbridge. I never knew Tunbridge to make an avowal of Materialism: he never wished for prosecution in its defence. The way he became connected with me was, by his good natured and great attention to the men in Newgate, and the Compter, who were arrested from the shop at the close of 1821; and when he was engaged as an assistant at Water Lane, it was on the condition, that he was not to be exposed to prosecution. Throughout his imprisonment, he has made a distinction between himself and the other prisoners, on the ground, that he was not a volunteer; and I have been as anxious not to make a distinction between them; but I found him so very irritable, and difficult to please, that I was soon compelled to drop all correspondence with him after his residence in Cold Bath Fields Prison. I am still sensible, that he has some good qualities, and I shall be ever ready to do him a service, if the opportunity offers, were it but for his kindness to those who were imprisoned before him. At present, he has renounced all connection with us, of which the Christians have made a handle as will be seen by the following extract from a religious Magazine.

“ADVERTISEMENT EXTRAORDINARY FROM THE
'TIMES' OF THE 16TH ULT.

“WILLIAM TUNBRIDGE requests the Deists, Atheists, and Materialists, as they style themselves, not to transmit to him any

further subscriptions, as from this period he declines all further connection with them.

“ House of Correction, Cold Bath Fields,
“ October 13, 1824.

“ This person is one of the young men who were employed at the shop of Mr. R. Carlile, to vend his blasphemous publications; and who, on his trial, manifested the most insolent and hardened spirit. May we not hope that ‘ God has given him repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth,’ and that ‘ he has recovered himself out of the snare of the devil.’ ”

BAPTIST MAGAZINE, NOVEMBER, Page 488.

It can scarcely be misunderstood, that Tunbridge seeks to pay his Christian Fine of £ 100., by the aid of the hypocrite of a Chaplain.

RICHARD CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE.

House of Correction, Cold Bath Fields,
December 13, 1824.

SIR,

TILL lodged in this house, I had perused only a single number of your Republican, and from that, together with exhibitions in your shop window, which outraged religious feeling, my opinion was against you; here, I found all the volumes of your periodical work, and sat down to review them; I had read the greater part of the first volume, when an unfortunate affray, between the Chaplain, and the owner of the book, deprived me of it. You are, I understand, a materialist, deny the existence of God, and say that all religion is vice. This is going great lengths; but, will you allow me to descend from Gods to pigs, and come home to your own door with a question? On the 17th of January, 1823, travelling towards Dorchester, and within two miles of it, my

No. 25, Vol. X.

speedier foot overtook a pig-driver ; by and by, observing that the greater part of the pigs had no tail, I asked, if it was the fashion thereabout to dock pigs "*Oh no,*" said the driver, "*the father of them pigs had no tail.*" Could you tell me how this takes place, I should then proceed with you to points of greater moment, relating to materialism, God, and religion.

The above is copied from a scroll written some four months ago ; a momentary effusion, which has ever since lain among my loose papers. Mean time I have addressed a series of letters to our Chaplain, in consequence of the affray spoken of. From what I read in your first volume, having formed an opinion that you were honest and brave, I was induced, on being denied your VOLUMES, to ask a friend to furnish me with your NUMBERS as they came out, and have now had a dozen of them. I shall subjoin copies of my letters, from which you will see that I am neither a Materialist nor Atheist. I was bred up in the belief that the Bible is the best book in the world : I still think so ; and your Republican has strengthened my belief ; nay with fair and full opportunity, I should hope to convince even you of this ; for, though you have an interest otherwise, and must be strongly biased to your present opinions, you appear to respect sound argument, and to be of a frank, open, and generous disposition.

I now address you especially, to express my sense of the infinite good which you, and those who support you, are doing to mankind, by combating for freedom of opinion. In that cause all your evasiveness, and abuse, and vulgarity, and dirt, is allowable, just as honourable warfare admits of dashing out brains, and surgery, of fingering filth. I sincerely hope that you, and the Newgate Corps, whose Magazine I have also from curiosity had sent me, will be able to hold out till persecution sickens, and no British jury will find a verdict against any thing called blasphemy, or libel on government. Then I should hope neither you, nor those in Newgate, should write as you do : indeed, you would not be countenanced ; and the Gospel, having free course would

be glorified. Travelling extensively in the United States of America, I saw that any thing but harm resulted from the unrestrained expression of opinion on politics and religion. Private affairs, and private characters cannot be too powerfully guarded: public functionaries and public institutions cannot be too open to exposure: nor the circulation of opinion too free. Our Chaplain has told me, that if we doubt one part of the Bible we must discredit all, adding that "*he that believeth not shall be damned.*" My belief is of a general nature: and, shaking hands with the Chaplain, who is a worthy sincere man, respected by every body here; remind him of *charity*, and hope that all of us may be saved; as "*with God nothing is impossible.*"

ROBERT GOURLAY.

LETTERS TO THE CHAPLAIN.

House of Correction, Cold Bath Fields,

DEAR SIR,

August 27, 1824.

THE first time that we met, you held in your hand a number of CARLILE'S REPUBLICAN; and were making comments upon it. This led us to converse on religion. You spoke of Dwight's Theology, and soon after sent me the first volume. I have read the first chapter on the existence of God several times over, and mean to copy it out. Tunbridge lent me at the same time, several volumes of the Republican and this too I began to peruse. Having a handful of Carlile's pointing to certain passages of Scripture, with a view to ridicule and disgust, I set to work, and turned over the Bible to find these; after reading some of them without discovering any thing wrong, I addressed you to make this known, but you became alarmed with the sight of the handbill, and from some mistake conceiving that it belonged to Tunbridge, you run off to him, and immediately after, he came to me violently agitated, saying, you had accused him of giving me the handbill. I desired him to tell you it was mine, and

he returned to deliver it to me: he has since, however, refused to lend me the Republican, or any other book, being afraid of censure. Now, let us reflect on this: *First*, when you read, and made comments on Carlile's publications, why should you be suspicious of others doing the same? why should you be suspicious at all, or afraid for the Bible? should you not remember the words of Gamaliel, "*if this work be of man it will come to nought, but if it be of God you cannot overthrow it.*" You will not, I trust, think it wrong of me to discover error: it is my duty; mark then, you are first, contrary to Gospel instruction, suspicious, uncharitable, and hasty in judgment: you accuse an innocent man, you set him up against me, and thereby I am deprived of a book, which I was reviewing, in order to defend the Bible. Mark, I say, this train, repent, and sin no more. As a proof of practical amendment, procure me a loan of Carlile's volumes: and then having Dwights Theology, I shall proceed with my review, which will occupy my time, I hope, profitably for myself, and others.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT GOURLAY.

House of Correction, Cold Bath Fields,

September 19, 1824.

DEAR SIR,

I HEREWITH return Dwights Theology, which you are to lend to Tunbridge, having still hope of reforming him. I have copied out proofs of the *Existence of God*, and read forward a little further. The author, says, in the first page, that the existence of God is the basis of religion, and in the ninth, that his manner of being is utterly incomprehensible. If so, why should we endeavour to comprehend God, or think more of religion? We can comprehend man and morality. I still think it a moral duty incumbent on you, to furnish me with Carlile's Republican, which you deprived me of, and which I hope to use in defending religion, and upholding the existence of God. I shall annex a copy of

the letter, which I read to you on the subject, and after reflection at home, shall expect of you, to furnish me with the book in question. Further, you told me, that you could make £500. or £600. a year, by teaching the classics, but were so fond of your present care, worth only £300, a year, that you would not leave it to have £1000. a year elsewhere. Do you think that I could assist you, by reading moral lectures to the prisoners? I flatter myself, that I could, and for my time, should be contented with very little pay. Be so good as to submit this to the Magistrates.

Yours truly,

ROBERT GOURLAY.

House of Correction, Cold Bath Fields,

October 11, 1824.

DEAR SIR,

ANNEXED, is a copy of a letter, handed last Thursday, to the visiting Magistrates in conformity, with what I told you before hand. I have received a verbal reply, through the governor, that the Magistrates give you £300. a year, for doing the whole duty, and leave every thing to your own discretion. Think then still of my proposal. My only wish, is, to employ my idle time, and do good. It would please me greatly, to visit the yards with you daily: learn the situation of prisoners; hear your advice to them, and suggest matters to you, for their farther improvement. As to moral lectures, any thing I should write, you should see before it was delivered. The——— has objected to my proposal, because he says I am confined for a misdemeanour, this I deny; but were it so, surely the precedent of Barrington, at Botany Bay, should remove the objection; and I shall begin my duties towards the——— himself. He told me one day, that he would, to save his life, turn King's evidence; now, were I an accomplice in crime, I would think myself bound to suffer death, rather than betray trust, and hang another person; speak to the clerk on this subject, and say whether he is right. It is a case in point, for the commencement of scrutiny into morals, and submission to your opinion. Think of all this, and communicate frankly.

ROBERT GOURLAY.

DEAR SIR, House of Correction, October 13, 1824.
You have told me that you shewed my last letter to the
———, and that he was angry ; now, it is an exercise of
morals, to enquire into this. Did he say that any thing in my
letter was untrue, I suppose not ; and feel that it is right, for
you and him, to consider whether it is sound principle, to
save ones own life at the expense of anothers, if it is sound
principle, all men should have the benefit of it : if unsound,
every man should be cautioned against so thinking and act-
ing ; I was convinced, that, the clerk thought it justifiable,
and therefore acquitting him, have no object, but, to come
at abstract truth. Study the matter, shew these, and con-
verse calmly with him again.

I proposed to you yesterday, to take as subjects for lecture
here, the specific crimes and circumstances, which had
brought people to confinement ; but this you objected to, say-
ing it would be preaching *at* individuals. Preaching *at* indivi-
duals out of prison, is odious, and unwarrantable ; but, Sir,
I maintain that it would be beneficial, and proper in this
place. The cases of prisoners are already known : have
been commented on, in open Court ; and no malice can be
inferred from further discussion of the same. Think of this
too ; and I shall argue the point at leisure if you choose.
There are clever men in this prison ; they might be
allowed to defend themselves in writing. It is possible
there are some innocent, even after condemnation under the
law ; and it would be a fine exercise of Christian charity, for
you to rescue such men ; you might lay their statement be-
fore visiting magistrates, and they might forward the same
to the Secretary of State, Chancellor, or the King. Thus
there would be free scope for *grace*. Judges may have
committed mistake : juries may have been wrong ; and sta-
tute law itself, may be found at variance with the greater law
of the Gospels. If you will begin by preaching *at* me, I
shall thank you, and no harm could ensue : or, if you like
better, I shall argue Tunbridge's case, or, that, of my next
door neighbour, both, of whom, I consider innocent. I nei-
ther approve of laws against blasphemy, nor gambling.
Blasphemy is mere matter of opinion ; and a man who plays
at a game of chance, is not a whit worse than speculators in
the funds. Christ, you know, was accused of blasphemy, and
handed over to the fury of the mob, without fair trial. The
Priests were the prime instigators ; but admirable would it
be for the Priests of these enlightened days, to prove all
things and be charitable.

The visiting Magistrates have told me through the Governor, that they do not interfere with your duties, and you again say, that you are under their authority. Produce this to them on Thursday, first or after a week's consideration at home, and yet come to a point on these two questions—whether you should not furnish me with Carlile's Republican, and whether you might not accept of my services in visiting prisoners, and addressing to them moral lectures?

I am, yours, &c.,

ROBERT GOURLAY.

DEAR SIR,

House of Correction, Nov. 8, 1824.

I WAS willing to think, and should be glad to find it true, that you preached at me yesterday, when you asked, "*how is it that there are so many in this prison for assaults?*" adding that Jesus Christ "*never used force;*" I took down these words, wishing you to think more of them, and give an explanation. Christ most assuredly used force when he drove the buyers and sellers out of the temple; he also advised him that had no sword to "*sell his garment and buy one. Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the High Priest's servant, and cut off his ear: then said Jesus unto Peter, put up thy sword into thy sheath.*" He further said, "*suffer ye thus far.*" Now, I would ask you if there is any thing which was done, or countenanced by Christ, which we may not do? I would bid you say what proportion of good has been brought about in the world without force; certainly the Reformation was not; I would ask if the church could stand without it? and call to your remembrance the following words, uttered by you in the chapel some months ago: "*all human affairs have a tendency to get worse—all churches become corrupt—and when men can endure them no longer they rise up and dash them to pieces.*" My anxious desire is to get at truth, and rightly to comprehend it, that thereby, I may act. Think well of the above, and advise me either in a sermon next Sunday, or privately by letters. I am perfectly sincere, and believe you to be so.

ROBERT GOURLAY.

N. B. You well remember of my speaking to you of "TINDAL'S CHRISTIANITY AS OLD AS THE CREATION," which you said was a good book. I have enquired for it of several people; but cannot get a copy. Could you borrow one for me, and still think of letting me have Carlile's Republican for review.

R. G.

DEAR SIR,

House of Correction, Nov. 20, 1824.

CONVERSING of my letters to you of the 8th instant, you told me that Christ had two powers; and from the pulpit last Sunday, preaching from the text about the pool of Silvan you said he had two characters, that of God and man; in the first of which he performed miracles, and drove the buyers and sellers out of the temple. You wish me to believe from this, that we must not in all things follow the example of Christ; but I maintain that whatever Christ did on earth, and in the person of a man, must have been meant at once for instruction and example to men. To what end else could be his driving out the buyers and sellers? Doing this only once could be of little avail; and, in reply to what you said of the temple being his father's house, is not every temple, or church, nay every house his father's? It was very odious to see the temple put to worldly purposes, and the conduct of Christ was evidently to shew, that when such flagrant abuses happen, men may forcibly interfere. Some one person, or persons must act, and the act must be virtuous. It was the peculiar duty of the priests to keep the temple free from pollution; and had they done so it might have stood till the end of time. As they neglected their duty, it became duty for others to correct abuses, and so we are taught by the example of Christ: when people interfere in the correction of evil, which has grown up under the eye of power, they must incur risk: they, by doing so, generally oppose the interests of those in power, and besides, stir up envy, which is still more dangerous. They must be devoted to the good work, and willing to sacrifice life in the cause

before they interfere: and so it was with Christ; he was not only willing, but did actually lose his life, because of interfering where the priests were remiss; all of which is beautifully instructive. Say that we are not, thence to take example, and you throw down the very purpose for which Christ suffered ignominy and death. The mandate for his followers to provide each a sword, even at the expence of his garment, is further illustrative of what we may do, and what we ought to do, in cases of urgent necessity. Nothing could so powerfully corroborate this, as the order to sell the very clothing from the body, whereby to have means for the purchase of a sword. It shews that truth and goodness must be maintained at all hazards; and the worth of the body is not to stand in competition with that of the soul; Christ suffered only the ear of a single individual to be cut off; but that was sufficient, it exhibited at once the mildness of his government and the vigour with which it should be maintained.

You well remember of saying that "*all churches become corrupt, and that, when men can endure them no longer they rise up and dash them to pieces.*" You did not say this was wrong; but on the contrary, left us to infer, that it was just and necessary. The grand point for us is, to observe the signs of the times—mark what is wrong in our own day, and determine what must require the interposition of force, if not corrected by the discretion of those in authority. We now see the Irish people in a state of continual starvation and convulsion. What is the chief cause of this? Undoubtedly the *state of the church*, which has aided the more immediate and great cause, the *state of the peasantry*. The tythes to the amount of millions are devoured by a priesthood who preach to less than a tenth part of the nation; who shew little desire to conciliate those who differ with them as to the non-essentials of religion. At this time it is a fact that two millions of the labouring poor of England are worse provided for than the felons of this prison. When it is so, you must be sensible that something is very wrong; and when you know that some six hundred persons sit in parlia-

ment as representatives of the people, when in fact they do not represent a hundredth part of the population, and while many obtain their seats by bribery and corruption; you cannot be at a loss to see the root from whence such evil has sprung: you cannot doubt but, by and by, force will be resorted to, if reason and duty do not begin to redress grievances.

Now, as to miracles, we are told that the disciples of Christ, who were mere men, performed many, and that it required only faith to remove mountains. You said that the miracles performed in the pool of Silvan was a revival of such doings after miracles had ceased to be wrought for four hundred years; and that it was supposed to be connected with the coming of Christ. My opinion is, that the troubling of the waters of Silvan was a trick of the Jewish priests, who had become depraved in the extreme, and had recourse to contrivances for keeping up their power and influence through the superstition of the vulgar; just as the priests of England kept up theirs till the time of Henry the Eighth, when their abominable tricks were exposed and put to shame by breaking up the religious houses. The story of the pool of Silvan does, nevertheless, very well to hang a moral on, and convey an idea of the helplessness of the poor; emblems, allegories, and fables out of count, throughout the Bible, answer such ends; Christ himself taught by parables, shewing that there was no real harm in this mode of illustration. It was not necessary that the machinery of these parables should be corporeal—that they should have existed, in reality, the characters exhibited; the end was to inculcate morality—to give clear ideas of truth and justice, and good conduct, and pure sentiments, which, without the aid of figures, could not be done. *Æsop* made beasts speak, and nobody found fault with him. Why then should we cavil about Balaam's ass? There is no necessity, I conceive, for believing that Eve brought sin and misery into the world by actually eating fruit from a tree, though the story most admirably portrays the frailty of

women, and shews how men may be ruined by them. In the same way the plagues of Egypt impress us with a just and necessary sense of the cruel and relentless spirit of tyranny. I look to them as mere hyperboles, intended for the best of purposes, and never wish to question the truth or falsehood of the story: Jesus Christ I revere as *personified goodness*; and as to God, I agree with Dwight, that he is altogether incomprehensible! Dwight has thrown no new light on the existence of God. Near thirty years since, I read the work of Samuel Clark, on the subject, written more than one hundred years ago, and, though he has ever since been considered a pillar of the church, I have called him a narrow-minded bigot; not out of disrespect to him, but to mark my sense of the presumption of endeavouring to defend the attributes of God, which are quite beyond human understanding. Perhaps our best way is to join with the poet as to God:

“Come then expressive silence muse his praise.”

I am conscious of intelligence within myself—conscious that this may be improved and greatly expounded. I find in nature objects on which this intelligence can operate—objects which it can unfold and profitably put to use. I believe, that by a due and dutiful application of this intelligence, man may in time “*rise from Nature up to Nature’s God.*” I believe, that this is the true end of all religion;—that the Christian religion aims at this, and that every religion which has the same end ought to be revered. I wish to disguise nothing, and shall be glad to be detected in error. I believe, that the authority of the Bible is greatly lessened by false views of its meaning, and pertinacious adherence to mere figures of speech. Its spirit throughout is admirable; its end is perfection; and its laws so clear, that he who runs may read. Let us but search the scriptures, and we shall more and more become acquainted with human nature—more and more detect, in the heart of man, the seeds of iniquity—more and more be assured, that it is “*deceitful*

above all things, and desperately wicked." Open confession and communication, I conceive to be the best purifiers of the heart; and thorough repentance the most acceptable offering to God for sin. It was by this that David, after committing the most horrid crimes, was especially beloved: it was by this, that one sinner saved is more esteemed in heaven than ninety-nine of the righteous. To give the benefit from this, I repeated his inadvertent speech about turning King's evidence. He was at first angry, you told me, but I shall venture to say, he is now pleased that it was spoken of: he must, by this time, have seriously reflected on the subject—seen that he was wrong, and tightened his principles accordingly. I put on record, your speech as to getting £500. and £600. a year by teaching the classics, in noblemen's families; and your saying, that you would not exchange your living here of £300. a year, for one of £1000. elsewhere. This could not but stagger my belief; and I wished you to think of its impropriety, if it was not true. The more I reflect upon it, the more it seems duty to bring you to confession on the subject. It appears to me, that if you could make £200. a year by teaching the classics, it was a great deal; and, that you could not be justifiable to your family, in giving up a larger for a smaller income, where the employment was respectable. You will do credit to yourself, and I shall like you the more, if you frankly call on me on Monday or Tuesday, and acknowledge this; you may then put what question you choose: and, if you suspect any thing to be wrong in my sentiments or conduct, it is your sacred duty, thus invited, to chatechise me strictly. Before I committed the act in the lobby of the House of Commons, which caused my confinement, I consulted a friend as to the propriety of that act, and he approved of it. He signed his name to a declaration of my principles; and a packet sealed up, in my possession, contains this declaration. I offered to the Speaker of the House of Commons to shew this to any one member of Parliament, in my defence. I mean soon to write a letter to the King, wherein I shall

make a similar offer, and I now wish you to put your name on the back of the sealed packet, to witness my intention. In all that I have written to you, the magistrates, and the governor, I have kept in view that my letters should form a train of evidence as to my being of sound mind, a matter of vital import to me; and, being thus apprised, you will more gravely consider matters. I deny that I have committed any crime to justify my imprisonment in this House; and yet I thank God for it, seeing that the quiet and retirement of the place enables me to get over a time of trouble—to reflect on past life, and put my affairs in order. They who have put me here are precisely circumstanced as those persons who brought a poor woman before Christ for condemnation. They accused me of madness, and most hypocritically arrayed mad doctors against me, in open Court, even after they knew, that their accusation was false. Can there be any thing more wicked? Is there a felon in this Prison who deserves punishment more than men who can be guilty of such conduct?

This shall be delivered to you tomorrow after service. Take it home with you: read it to your family: reflect upon the whole of it well: call upon me and discuss every point:—finally, lay this before the Magistrates here on Thursday. I am still of opinion, that you ought to furnish me with Carlile's Republican, for review. I say so, not because I am under any necessity to ask it; for I could get the book elsewhere, if I choose; but to remind you of a moral duty. You, and the Magistrates may also yet consider of allowing me to visit the yards, and make enquiries, along with you, as to the various circumstances of prisoners: their progress to improvement, and the means which may accelerate this.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT GOURLAY.

TO THE CHAIRMAN OF VISITING MAGISTRATES.

House of Correction, Cold Bath Fields,

December 9, 1824.

SIR,

ABOVE I have copied out a series of letters addressed by me to the Chaplain. I expected he would have laid the last before the Magistrates according to my request, but he called only two days ago, and said he would not do this. It will be remembered, that I pledged myself to exhibit to the Magistrates whatever I wrote as to the prison, and therefore I now furnish you with these copies for perusal. Though the Chaplain and I differ in opinion, we have parted good friends. He says it is really true, that he made £500. a year before coming to this House, though he worked hard for it; and also, that he would not accept double the sum, and be obliged to give up his present charge. He has told me of a Clergyman near Oxford, who has acted on the same principle, and prefers a mere trifle of stipend, where he now resides, to advancement in the Church, and affluence. On this subject it remains for us only to pray, that the infection may spread over the land.

The Chaplain will not yet supply me with the volumes which his interference deprived me of; and, as to visiting prisoners, continues to say, he is under the guidance of the Magistrates. He would not sign his name on the back of my packet, but has put his *mark*, with the date, which will do for me.

The Magistrates, after due reflection on the contents of this, and the accompanying sheet, may, if they choose, forward these to the Secretary of State.

Your obedient Servant,

ROBERT GOURLAY.

NOTICES.

WE have published the Posthumous Pieces of Elihu Palmer, with his memoir, in a separate pamphlet.—Price Sixpence.

ERRATUM.

THE Republican is still filled with these; and I must entreat the reader's patience and pardon, as I fear it will never be otherwise whilst I am a prisoner, and I cannot at present afford to pay a competent reader to attend the office. I have many friends who would willingly correct the proofs at their homes; but we find that this cannot be regularly attended to with a periodical work. In the first page of No. 24, *Christianical* should have been *Christianicidal*. It means a killing of Christianity. A new word certainly; but I feel the same right to coin words as all who have gone before me: and my printer feels the right to change them to what he pleases. So, between us, we make sad work.

RICHARD CARLILE.

SUBSCRIPTION IN LIVERPOOL FOR THE BENEFIT OF RICHARD CARLILE, AND HIS IMPRISONED SHOPMEN.

November 21, 1824.

	£.	s.	d.
John Hobson	1	0	0
H. M.	0	5	0
F. T.	0	10	0

A Friend	0	5	0
William Harvey	0	10	0
James Harvey	0	10	0
John Harvey	0	5	0
Samuel Harvey	0	5	0
Enoch Harvey	0	10	0
Samuel Parks	0	5	0
J. A. Tate	0	10	0
W. T.	0	1	0
J. Smith	0	5	0
W. B.	0	1	0
Charles Hughes	0	5	0
J. Wood	0	2	6
J. Crook	0	5	0
W. S., a Calvinist	0	5	0
R. H.	0	5	0
E. S.	0	5	0

November 20, received from
Peter Woods, on account of
monies collected by him 3 10 6

Subscriptions received at 84, Fleet Street.

W. J., for September, for Mr. Carlile	0	2	0
Ditto, for W. Campion	0	1	0
Woodmansell Crayford	0	2	6
Mr. Watts, for Mrs. Wright	0	1	0
J. H., Quarterly Subscription for Mr. Carlile	3	0	0
J. H., for Mr. Carlile	4	0	0
W. J., for October, for Mr. Carlile	0	2	0
Ditto, for W. Campion	0	1	0
Hibernicus of Bath, for Mrs. Jefferies	0	1	0
W. Crook of Bath	0	1	0
Jane Rainbird	0	0	6
J. Nicholson	0	1	0
Joseph Waller	0	1	0
Richard Green	0	0	6
Innocent	0	5	0

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 84, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican" to be left at the place of publication.